

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Currently, claims 1-8 and 15-19 are pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 15-19 have been indicated as being allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103:

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Hibbard (U.S. '054). Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Hibbard. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

For a reference to anticipate a claim, each element must be found, either expressly or under principles of inherency, in the reference. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all of the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that Hibbard fails to disclose or suggest each of the claimed limitations. For example, Hibbard fails to disclose or suggest "engaging each of the plurality of dovetails into respective dovetail slots, wherein only a subset of the plurality of said dovetails engaged in respective dovetail slots contact respective laminations to define respective contact points," as required by independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 which depend therefrom.

This feature is supported by, for example, Figs. 2-3 and page 5, line 14 to page 6, line 4 of the originally-filed specification. Only some (not all, i.e., a subset) of the plurality of laminations define contact points along a longitudinal direction of the stator core. Hibbard fails to disclose or suggest only a subset (some but not all) of the

plurality of dovetails contacting respective laminations to define contact points.

While Hibbard discloses dovetails 5 being engaged into respective dovetail slots of stator core laminations 2, Hibbard fails to disclose a subset of these dovetails contacting respective laminations 2 to define respective contact points. If anything, Hibbard discloses each of the dovetails engaging dovetail slots of stator core laminations 2 in a uniform fashion. That is, there is no teaching in Hibbard of different types of engagement between the dovetails and respective dovetail slots so that a subset (some but not all) of the laminations define contact points.

Applicant also submits that Hibbard fails to disclose or even suggest “the contact points having respective locations along a longitudinal direction of the stator core such that a force load transmitted by said contact points is evenly distributed among said contact points,” as further required by independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 which depend therefrom.

The Office Action apparently alleges that elements 5 and 6 in Fig. 2 disclose the above claimed feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Col. 3, lines 54 *et seq.* of Hibbard states:

“The stator core laminations are held in the stator frame 1 by suitable means such as dovetail keys 5 secured to transverse ribs 6 in the stator frame. The core illustrated in the drawings is built up of segmental laminations each of a length equal to twice the distance between the keys, and alternate segments are staggered so as to break joints between adjacent layers.”

While Fig. 2 of Hibbard thus discloses stator core laminations 2 being held in stator frame 1 by dovetail keys 5 and ribs 6 in stator frame 1, Hibbard fails to disclose

or even suggest defining contact points between respective ones of keys 5 and laminations 2 to control the transmitted force load, let alone evenly distributing the force load as required by independent claim 1. In short, Hibbard fails to disclose anything specific regarding force load distribution. As described in the background of the present application, actual contact locations between key bar dovetails and corresponding laminations were often (until the present invention) randomly distributed. In the present invention, contact points are defined at respective locations along a longitudinal direction of the stator core to evenly distribute force load. This feature is not taught nor disclosed by Hibbard.

Independent claim 6 and claim 7 which depends therefrom require, *inter alia*, “wherein said locations of contact points are defined by varying a cross-sectional area of said dovetail slots so that **at least two of said laminations respectively have dovetail slots which have different cross-sectional areas** (emphasis added).”

Hibbard fails to teach or suggest this claimed limitation. In particular, while Hibbard discloses slots defined in stator core laminations 2 for receiving dovetail keys 5, Hibbard fails to disclose any of these slots formed in the stator core laminations 2 having different cross-sectional areas. The Office Action does not specifically address this limitation at all. Applicant thus submits that Hibbard fails to teach or suggest each element required by claims 6 and 7.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Hibbard in view of Forbes et al (U.S. ‘035, hereinafter “Forbes”). Since claim 8 depends from claim 1, all of the comments made above with respect to Hibbard apply

DAWSON et al
Application No. 10/073,209
March 12, 2004

equally to claim 8. Forbes fails to remedy the above described deficiencies of Hibbard. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 8 is not "obvious" over Hibbard and Forbes and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4044
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100